



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/924,725

08/09/2001

Naoto Arakawa

35.C15674

3968

5514 7590 08/06/2007
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

LETT, THOMAS J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2625

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/06/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/924,725

Applicant(s)

ARAKAWA, NAOTO

Examiner

Thomas J. Lett

Art Unit

2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 May 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 29-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 29-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 9 August 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 21 May 2007 with respect to claims 29-45 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant argues that "Pepin is not seen to disclose or suggest at least the feature of a store controller unit for a printing device that causes a memory unit which can store data of a plurality of jobs to store data of a first type job, wherein the data of the first type job is stored in a memory unit without starting a printing by said printing device in accordance with a first request via a user interface unit of said remote computer, the data of the first type job being printed in accordance with a second request via the user interface unit of said printing device. As Pepin does not provide for storing of print data without starting printing, Pepin cannot provide a printing result of scan image data attached to printing results of the data of the first type job as a bundle of printing results as featured in Claim 29." Examiner responds to the amended claims with the prior art of Pepin et al combined with that of Knodt et al (USPN 5,124,731 A). The prior art of Knodt can reorder/arrange the stored images (including front and back covers) before they are printed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 2625

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 29-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pepin et al (USPN 6,151,131 A) in view of Knodt et al (USPN 5,124,731 A).

Regarding claim 29, Pepin et al discloses a printing system (printing system 2, see Fig. 1) which enables execution of printing of data of a job output from a remote computer (image data from remote sources, col. 5, lines 63-67), by a printing device (e.g., remote devices (scanners, printers, etc.) from network 5, col. 5, line 63 – col. 6, line 1), said system comprising:

a store controller unit (controller section 7, col. 6, line 64 – col. 7, line 20) that causes a memory unit (system memory 61, col. 7, lines 15-21) which can store data of a plurality of jobs (different print jobs, col. 7, line 18) to store data of a first type job, without starting of printing of the data of said first type job by said printing device, in a case where a job output from said remote computer is said first type job of said first type job corresponding to a job that a first request was performed in said remote computer and a second type job corresponding to a job that said first request was not performed in said remote computer (“without starting of printing ...” reads on delaying completion of a job based on triggered events, see at least col. 2, lines 5-7 and col. 11, lines 16-20);

a user interface controller unit (UI 52 includes a combined operator controller/CRT display consisting of an interactive touchscreen 62, keyboard 64, and mouse 66, see at least col. 7, lines 21-23 and col. 7, lines 37-48) that causes a user interface unit of said printing device to execute display for selecting at least one of said

Art Unit: 2625

plurality of jobs (see at least Fig. 6) including said first type job that data has been stored in said memory unit; and

an operation controller unit (UI 52 includes a combined operator controller/CRT display consisting of an interactive touchscreen 62, keyboard 64, and mouse 66, see at least col. 7, lines 21-23 and col. 7, lines 37-48) that causes said printing device to execute a first operation that performs printing of scan image data obtained by using a scanner unit to a sheet needed as a cover sheet of a print of said first type job (see Fig. 6) and that causes said printing device to execute a second operation that performs the printing of data of said first type job that data has been stored in said memory unit without starting of the printing by said printing device ("without starting of printing ...") reads on delaying completion of a job based on triggered events, see at least col. 2, lines 5-7 and col. 11, lines 16-20), in a case where said first type job is selected from said plurality of jobs via the display and in a case where a second request is performed via said user interface unit of said printing device.

Pepin et al do not explicitly disclose that the data of the first type job is stored in the memory unit without starting a printing by said printing device in accordance with the first request via a user interface unit of said remote computer, the data of the first type job being printed in accordance with the second request via the user interface unit of said printing device, and wherein a printing result of the scan image data is attached to printing results of the data of the first type job as a bundle of printing results.

Knodt et al teach a printing system 2 that allows cover jobs to be added to a job (covers that are scanned into memory), if required, before the job printing is executed.

Art Unit: 2625

If the decision determining if the front and back covers are ready is true, then printing may be executed using cover data stored in memory, see at least col. 9, line 50 – col. 10, line 16, and figs. 13-17C.

Pepin et al and Knodt et al are analogous art because they are from the similar problem solving area of image processing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the memory printing feature of Knodt et al to the system of Pepin et al in order to obtain a system capable of adding additional job content prior to printing. The motivation for doing so would be to store job content in memory prior to printing.

Regarding claim 30, Pepin et al discloses a printing system according to Claim 29, wherein, in the case where the job output from said remote computer is said first type job corresponding to the job that the first request was performed in said remote computer, said store controller unit causes said memory unit to store the data of said first type job in a state of raster image data without starting of the printing by said printing device (inherent since it is known that before a typical print job, e.g., a PDL file, can be printed, its contents (that are stored) must be converted to a bit-mapped image format, also known as a raster image. A raster image processor in a server or printer typically translates PDL files to a raster (or "RIP'ed") version of the file; in addition see col. 6, lines 1-4).

Regarding claim 31, Pepin et al discloses a printing system according to Claim 29, wherein said user interface controller unit causes said user interface unit of said printing device to display as said display a list screen formed to be able to discriminate

Art Unit: 2625

document names of said plurality of jobs (the job program may display job types and tickets for the jobs to be processed, see at least Fig. 6).

Regarding claim 32, Pepin et al discloses a printing system according to Claim 29, wherein, in the case where said first type job is selected from said plurality of jobs via the display and in a case where a third request is performed via said user interface unit of said printing device, said operation controller unit causes said printing device to execute a third operation that performs printing of scan image data of two pages obtained by using the scanner unit to two sheets needed as a front cover sheet and a back cover sheet of a print of said first type job without performing said first operation, and causes said printing device to execute said second operation (delaying completion of a job based on triggered events reads on the ability of the prior art to tailor jobs and job tickets based on events such as creating covers and scanning sheets, see at least col. 2, lines 5-7 and col. 11, lines 16-20).

Regarding claim 33, Pepin et al discloses a printing system according to Claim 29, wherein, in the case where said first type job is selected from said plurality of jobs via the display and in a case where a fourth request is performed via said user interface unit of said printing device, said operation controller unit causes said printing device to execute a fourth operation that performs printing of scan image data of three pages obtained by using the scanner unit to a plurality of insert sheets to be inserted to a print of said first type job without performing said first operation, and causes said printing device to execute said second operation (delaying completion of a job based on triggered events reads on the ability of the prior art to tailor jobs and job tickets based

Art Unit: 2625

on events such as creating covers and scanning sheets, see at least col. 2, lines 5-7 and col. 11, lines 16-20).

Regarding claim 34, Pepin et al discloses a printing system according to Claim 29, wherein, in the case where said first type job is selected from said plurality of jobs via the display and in a case where a fifth request is performed via said user interface unit of said printing device, said operation controller unit causes said printing device to execute a fifth operation that performs printing of scan image data of four pages obtained by using the scanner unit to a plurality of insert sheets to be inserted to a print of said first type job without performing said first operation, and causes said printing device to execute said second operation (delaying completion of a job based on triggered events reads on the ability of the prior art to tailor jobs and job tickets based on events such as creating covers and scanning sheets, see at least col. 2, lines 5-7 and col. 11, lines 16-20).

Regarding claim 35, Pepin et al discloses a printing system according to Claim 29, wherein, in a case where a specific instruction is input via said user interface unit of said printing device before said second request, said operation controller unit causes to delete the data of said first type job from said memory unit after completion of said second operation (touchscreen 62 of Fig. 6 has a provision for printing and deleting a job to be processed).

Regarding claim 36, Pepin et al discloses a printing system according to Claim 29, wherein, in a case where a job output from said remote computer is said second type job, said operation controller allows that printing of data of said second type job is

Art Unit: 2625

started by said printing device (delaying completion of a job based on triggered events, see at least col. 2, lines 5-7 and col. 11, lines 16-20).

Claim 37, a method claim, is rejected for the same reason as claim 29.

Claim 38, a method claim, is rejected for the same reason as claim 30.

Claim 39, a method claim, is rejected for the same reason as claim 31.

Claim 40, a method claim, is rejected for the same reason as claim 32.

Claim 41, a method claim, is rejected for the same reason as claim 33.

Claim 42, a method claim, is rejected for the same reason as claim 34.

Claim 43, a method claim, is rejected for the same reason as claim 35.

Claim 44, a method claim, is rejected for the same reason as claim 36.

Claim 45, a medium storing program claim, is rejected for the same reason as claim 29 (and see col. 3, line 66 – col. 4, line 18).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 2625

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas J. Lett whose telephone number is (571) 272-7464. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K. Moore can be reached on (571) 272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Thomas Lett
AU 2625



DAVID MOORE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600